

Order Paper Questions

installed equipment pending final acceptance testing by the Department or pending the fulfillment of the 120-day period of notice that must be given to the Canadian Union of Postal Workers. There have also been situations where new equipment was not promptly used in new plants, while operations were being transferred in stages from another location.

3. (a) No. (b) Not applicable.

4. (a) and (b) Postal employees may be relocated from one city to another under any of the following circumstances: (i) As the result of a request submitted by the employee for a lateral transfer, normally based on medical, economic or compassionate grounds. As the request in this circumstance would be originated by the employee, the question of refusal is not applicable. (ii) As the result of a successful application for promotion to a position at another geographical location. Again, as the application would be originated by the employee, the question as to refusal does not apply. (iii) As the result of lack of work at the original location. Every effort would be made to find alternative employment at the original location. If this is not possible, every effort would be made to find a suitable position elsewhere. If suitable employment is located at another geographical location and the employee refused to relocate, the employee would not be dismissed. Instead he/she would become a lay-off and subject to the lay-off procedures which have been established for public servants.

5. (a), (b) and (c) An employee's place of work may be changed within a city. The circumstances under which this could occur would include: (i) Phasing out of an existing facility. (ii) Decrease in the number of employees at a continuing facility. (iii) The bidding process wherein employees exercise their seniority rights in the filling of vacant positions. In (i) and (ii) above consideration would be given to such factors as home, transportation, schooling, etc. insofar as is practical. Employees are not forced to transfer and are not threatened with dismissal if they refuse to transfer. On the other hand, if there is no work for an employee at one location and that employee is not prepared to present himself at another location where there is suitable work, then that employee of necessity would become a lay-off.

6. Late pay cheques cause dissatisfaction among postal employees. If this occurs, the Post Office Department and the Department of Supply and Services work to correct the problem and minimize the risk of recurrence.

7. Although figures are available as to the number of employees involved each year in the commission of thefts or other offences in the Post Office, a breakdown is not available as to the category of employees involved.

8 and 9. The turnover rate for postal operations non-supervisory sub-groups for 1975 was approximately 7.24 percent nationally. Less than one percent (0.55 percent) of this turnover was from mechanized postal plants. Neither figure is considered abnormally high.

[Mr. Blais.]

COST OF TELEGRAMS SENT BY GOVERNMENT

Question No. 630—**Mr. Beatty:**

What was the cost to the taxpayer of telegrams sent by the government in 1975?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): For many departments and agencies, the cost of telegrams alone is not available, it includes amount spent on telegraph, cable and wireless communications. Agriculture Canada, \$15,347.83; Communications, \$5,091.28; Consumer and Corporate Affairs, \$31,396.00*; Energy, Mines and Resources, \$30,902.46; Atomic Energy Control Board, \$182.02; National Energy Board, \$20,540.98; Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, \$36,694.00; Environment Canada, \$191,474.00; Finance, \$9,701.11; Anti-Inflation Board, \$2,008.37; Auditor General, \$142.04; Insurance, \$38.00; Health and Welfare Canada, \$101,585.00; Indian and Northern Affairs, \$72,286.33*; Industry, Trade and Commerce, \$89,966.10*; Foreign Investment Review Agency, \$2,309.32*; Statistics Canada, \$4,782.86; Justice (Including its agencies), \$3,700.30*; Labour Canada, \$1,630.30*; Canada Labour Relations Board, \$1,763.46; Manpower and Immigration, \$41,324.15; National Defence, \$144,749.00*; Revenue Canada, \$40,793.90; Post Office, \$181,458.00*; Prime Minister's and Privy Council Offices, \$12,644.00*; Public Service Staff Relations Board, \$326.51; Public Works, \$192,000.00*; Regional Economic Expansion, \$6,190.85*; Science and Technology, \$2,477.90; Canadian Patents and Development Limited, \$160.34; National Research Council of Canada, \$6,243.87; Science Council of Canada, \$610.48*; Secretary of State, \$17,395.22*; External Affairs, \$4,462,100.00; Other government departments generate 50% of the telegrams transmitted over the facilities of the Department of External Affairs. The total cost of operating the network in 1975 was \$8,924,200.00. This includes telegraphic costs, capital cost of equipment amortized over 10 years, salaries, allowances and overtime. Canadian International Development Agency, \$5,881.50; Solicitor General, \$886.00; Royal Canadian Mounted Police, \$9,985.14; Canadian Penitentiary Service and National Parole Service, \$4,864.22; National Parole Board, \$1,041.93; Supply and Services, \$132,474.59; Transport Canada, \$200,714.82; Treasury Board, \$5,477.24; Urban Affairs, \$298.46*; National Capital Commission, \$581.30; Veterans Affairs, \$4,810.83; other departments and agencies have submitted a Nil reply.

*Fiscal year 1975/76

USE OF GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Question No. 632—**Mr. Beatty:**

1. Did the Secretary of State travel to London and Stratford on July 9, 1976, and, if so, what (a) are the details of the cost (b) was the total cost?

2. What are the names of all passengers aboard the aircraft and what was their reason for travelling to London and Stratford?

3. (a) How did the passengers travel between London and Stratford and return (b) what was the cost to the taxpayer, if any, of the ground transportation used?